

REMARKS

Claims 80-125 were pending when last examined. Claims 24-79 are canceled and claims 1-23 are withdrawn. By the present Response, applicants cancel claims 85, 86, 93, 100, 101, 108, 115, 116 and 123, and amend claims 80-84, 87-90, 94-99, 102-105, 109-114, 117-120, 124, and 125. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendment can be found at least in FIGS. 2, 4, and 5, and the corresponding description in the specification.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 80-90, 92-93, 96-98, 99-105, 107-108, 111-113, 114-120, and 122 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0095791 by Barton et al. (“Barton”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Barton is a national stage entry of PCT application No. PCT/US01/06313 filed on February 27, 2001. The present application claims priority to Korean Application No. 10-2000-40591 which was filed on July 14, 2000. A certified translation of the priority Korean Application is filed with this Response. As the priority Korean application was filed before Barton, applicants respectfully submit that Barton is not prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

To the extent that Barton claims priority to provisional application No. 60/186,551 (“the Barton Provisional”), applicants submit that the Barton Provisional has a substantially different disclosure than Barton itself (for example, the Barton Provisional does not include figures), and applicants cannot find in the Barton Provisional those sections to which the Examiner points in Barton. Thus, if the Examiner believes that any portion of the Barton Provisional is relevant to the subject matter claimed in the present application, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to identify those portions in the Barton Provisional.

Although Barton is not believed to be prior art to the present application, the claims have been amended to more clearly define the subject matter the applicants regard as their invention.

Claim 80, as amended, recites a method implemented by an apparatus for processing information related to consumption of multimedia content. The method includes receiving one or more group descriptions. Each of the group descriptions describes content elements

common in a respective group of multimedia objects and includes a title for the respective group and a group identifier that is a distinct element of the group description and identifies the respective group of multimedia objects. The group identifier and at least a portion of each of the one or more group descriptions is stored in the apparatus. A first content description and a first group description are received. The first content description describes content in a first multimedia object and includes (i) a title for the first multimedia object, (ii) a first object identifier that identifies the first multimedia object, and (iii) a first group reference that includes a first group identifier to identify a first group of multimedia objects to which the first multimedia object belongs. The first group description describes content elements common in the first group of multimedia objects and includes at least a title for the first group of multimedia objects. The first group identifier is compared with the group identifier of each respective group of the one or more previously stored group descriptions if the first multimedia object is displayed on a terminal of the apparatus. If the first group identifier is different from the previously stored group identifiers, the method includes storing in the apparatus the first group identifier and at least a portion of the first group description about common content elements in the first group of multimedia objects.

Applicants respectfully submit that Barton (like the Barton Provisional) fails to disclose several limitations of the claim. For example, although Barton discloses program guide information, it fails to disclose a group description which describes content elements common in a respective group of multimedia objects. Barton also lacks the claimed group identifiers as well as the claimed first content description describing content in a first multimedia object and including a first group reference that includes a first group identifier to identify a first group of multimedia objects to which the first multimedia object belongs. Lacking the claimed group identifiers, Barton cannot disclose comparing the first group identifier with the group identifier of each respective group of the previously stored group descriptions. Because Barton fails to disclose at least the above limitations, claim 80 should be allowed. Claims 81-84, 87-90, and 92, depend from claim 80 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Independent claims 96 and 111 recite limitations that are similar to those discussed above with reference to claim 80. As Barton fails to disclose at least those limitations, claims 96 and 111 are allowable. Claims 97-99, 102-105, 107, 112-114, 117-120, and 122 are dependent claims that are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 91, 95, 106, 110, 121, and 125 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barton in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,344,879 to Kim et al. (“Kim”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

As discussed above with reference to claim 80, Barton is not believed to be prior art to the present application. Furthermore, applicants respectfully submit that Kim is prior art to the present application under 102(e) and was assigned to the same assignee, LG Electronics, as the present application at the time the present invention was made. Thus, according to 35 U.S.C. 103(c)(1), Kim cannot be used to reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Furthermore, claims 91, 95, 106, 110, 121, and 125 are dependent claims. As discussed above with reference to their base claims, Barton lacks several limitations of the claimed subject matter. Kim is also lacking. Kim discloses an electronic program guide and information about actors or actresses, but lacks the claimed group description, group identifiers, and comparing step. Thus, claims 91, 95, 106, 110, 121, and 125 are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Claims 94, 109, and 124 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barton in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,973,683 to Cragun et al. (“Cragun”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

As discussed above with reference to claim 80, Barton is not believed to be prior art to the present application. Furthermore, claims 94, 109, and 124 are dependent claims. As discussed above with reference to their base claims, Barton lacks several limitations of the claimed subject matter. Cragun is also lacking. Cragun discloses censorship based on genre,

but lacks the claimed group description, group identifiers, and comparing step. Thus, claims 94, 109, and 124 are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

CONCLUSION


Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue. Should the Examiner wish to discuss the Application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (415) 772-7493.

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

10/9/07 Richard A. Pask
Date Signature

Respectfully submitted,


By: _____ Ferenc Pazmandi
Agent of Record
Limited Recognition No. L0078
FP/rp

October 9, 2007

SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
555 California Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94104-1715
(415) 772-7200